



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

W. 42; *Courvoisier v. Raymond* (1896), 23 Colo. 113, 47 Pac. R. 284; *New Orleans &c. R. Co. v. Jopes* (1891), 142 U. S. 18, 12 S. Ct. 109, 35 L. Ed. 919; *Zell v. Dunnaway* (1911), 115 Md. 1, 80 Atl. R. 215. See on the subject of self-defense, DICEY, *LAW OF THE CONSTITUTION*, 8th Ed. Note IV, pp. 489-497.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—ANTI-TIPPING STATUTE.—Action was brought on a writ of *habeas corpus* to test the validity of a California statute (Laws of 1917, ch. 172) which declared it a misdemeanor for any employer to require or accept from an employee, as a condition of the employment, any part of the tips received by such employee. *Held*, that the statute was unconstitutional as an unwarranted interference with the right of contract. *Ex parte Farbe* (Cal., 1918), 174 Pac. 320.

The majority of the court were of the opinion that the statute would not conduce to the elimination of the custom of tipping, which the court admitted was an evil whose eradication is desirable. No authority was cited except upon the general matter of restriction of contract. It has been held that tips turned over to an employer, in the mistaken belief that he demanded them, could be recovered by the employee. *Polites v. Barlin*, 149 Ky. 376; *Zappas v. Roumeliote*, 156 Iowa 709. Tips may be included as part of one's earnings, under the workman's compensation acts, *Sloat v. Rochester Taxi Co.*, 163 N. Y. S. 904; *Gt. Western Ry. Co. v. Helps*, (H. of L.) 1918, A. C. 141. A statute of Mississippi prohibiting the acceptance of tips, and forbidding employers to allow tipping, was assumed to be constitutional in *State v. Angelo*, 109 Miss. 624, and *State v. So. Ry. Co.*, 112 Miss. 23, although the indictments in both cases were dismissed on other grounds. A Tennessee statute (Laws of 1915, ch. 185) appears never to have been passed on.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—RACE-SEGREGATION ORDINANCES.—Plaintiffs sued to enjoin the City of Atlanta from carrying on criminal prosecutions under the city ordinance providing for race segregation. *Held*, injunction should issue. *Glover v. City of Atlanta* (Ga., 1918), 96 S. E. 526.

A similar ordinance was passed upon by the Supreme Court of the United States in *Buchanan v. Warley*, 245 U. S. 60, and declared unconstitutional. For a discussion of that decision see 16 MICH. L. REV. 109, and 31 HARV. L. REV. 475. The Georgia supreme court had held the ordinance valid in *Harden v. City of Atlanta*, 147 Ga. 248. In the instant case, however, it declared itself bound by the decision of the Supreme Court and reversed its original opinion.

EQUITY—JURISDICTION TO CANCEL WHERE LEGAL DEFENSE EXISTS.—A contract for advertising services for twelve months was superseded by another contract for sixty months, which was procured through misrepresentation that the term was only twelve months. In a suit to reform or cancel the second contract, *held* that equity has jurisdiction although the defense of fraud could be made at law. *Smith-Austermuhl Co. v. Jersey Railways Advertising Co.* (N. J. Ch., 1918), 103 Atl. 388.